



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/574,165	05/18/2000	Gary S. Burd	MS	6904
22801	7590	12/04/2003	144239.1/40062.49US01	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER NARAYANASWAMY, SINDYA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/574,165

Applicant(s)

BURD ET AL

Examiner

Sindya Narayanaswamy

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 - 37 are presented for examination.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(b)*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102(b) that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless – (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4, 7, 12, 16-19, and 21-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ferris, WO 98/44695.

4. As per claims 1, 16 and 17 Ferris teaches the method, signal and computer program storage medium for performing server-side processing of postback input received from a client and associated with a client-side user interface element (pressing of a button on browser display), the method comprising: examining the postback input to determine an identifier of a target server-side control object (Association); identifying the target server-side control object (Action Controller) based on the identifier of the target server-side control object; passing the postback input to the target server-side control object; and processing the postback input passed to the target server-side control object (page 8, line 19-page 9, line 10).

5. As per claim 2, Ferris teaches the method wherein the processing operation comprises changing a property of the target server-side control object; and further

Art Unit: 2174

comprising: generating authoring language data from the target server-side control object based on the property to define the client-side user interface element (browser's display) for transmission to the client (update displays using new values) (page 9, lines 3-10).

6. As per claim 3, Ferris teaches the method wherein the processing operation comprises raising a server-side event from the target server-side control object; and further comprising: generating authoring language data from the target server-side control object based on the property to define the client-side user interface element for transmission to the client (page 9, lines 3-10).

7. As per claim 4, Ferris teaches the method creating a plurality of server-side control objects in a server-side control object hierarchy (classes of associations) prior to the operation of processing the postback input; and terminating the plurality of server side control objects, after the operation of generating authoring language data (page 22, lines 8-25).

8. As per claim 7, Ferris teaches the method wherein the operation of processing the postback input comprises: storing a postback data value (enabled or disabled) as a property the target server-side control object (page 24, lines 10-19).

9. As per claim 12, Ferris teaches the method wherein the operation of processing the postback input comprises: processing a postback event using the target server-side control object (page 8, line 19-page 9, line 10).

10. As per claim 18, it is rejected on the same basis as claims 1 and 2.

11. As per claims 19, 21 and 22, they are similar in scope to claim 1 and are rejected on the same basis as claim 1.

12. As per claim 23, Ferris teaches a computer system comprising a plurality of server-side control objects in a server-side control object hierarchy on a server, the server side control object hierarchy including a target server side control object associated with a client-side user interface element on a client (*pressing of buttons at different levels in hierarchy on browser display*), such that input data received by the server from the client-side user interface element is passed within the server to the target server-side control object in the server-side control object hierarchy (page. 3, lines 28-29); the plurality of server-side control objects generating authoring language data to define a web page for display on the client (page 4, line 21-page 5, line 2).

13. As per claim 24, Ferris teaches a computer program product embodied in a computer readable medium for executing a computer process, the computer process comprising: generating authoring language data from a plurality of server-side control objects at a server to define a page for display on a client (*hypertext link displays page*), the authoring language data including a script that is tagged to be executed by the server to process input data received from the client (*client's browser displays data received by executed command*) (page 4, line 21-page 5, line 2).

14. As per claim 25, Ferris teaches the computer program product wherein each server-side control object corresponds to a client-side user interface element (boxes, buttons, windows, etc.) (page 6, lines 3-16).

15. As per claim 26, Ferris teaches a method comprising: generating authoring language data from a plurality of server-side control objects at a server to define a web page for display on a client (URL), the authoring language (HTML) data including a script that is tagged to be executed by the server to process input data received from the client (page 4, line 21-page 5, line 2).

16. As per claim 27, it is similar in scope to claim 23 and is rejected on the same basis.

17. As per claim 28, Ferris teaches the method wherein the processing operation comprises: setting a property value of the identified server-side control object based on the input data (FORM elements entered, and then transmitted – ie, NAME, CITY, etc..) (page 6, lines 8-10).

18. As per claim 29, Ferris teaches the method wherein the processing operation comprises: raising an event in the identified server-side control object based on the input data (action to be invoked to the server) (page 9, lines 1-2).

Art Unit: 2174

19. As per claim 30, Ferris teaches the method of claim 27 further comprising:  
generating authoring language data from a plurality of server-side control objects at a server to define a page for display on the client, the page including the individual client-side user interface element (HTML documents) (page 6, lines 3-10).

20. As per claim 31, Ferris teaches the method of claim 27, further comprising  
generating authoring language data from a plurality of server-side control objects at a server to define a page for display on the client, the authoring language data including a script that is tagged to be executed by the server to process input data received from the client (applets update display after execution) (page 9, lines 1-10).

21. As per claims 32-36, they are similar in scope to claims 27-31 and are rejected on the same basis.

22. As per claim 37, it is similar in scope to claim 27 and is rejected on the same basis.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

23. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time of the invention the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to which said

Art Unit: 2174

subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

24. Claims 5, 6, 8-11, 13-15 and 20 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ferris, WO 98/44695.

25. As per claim 5, Ferris does not specifically teach the method comprising: searching for the target server-side control object in a server-side control hierarchy based on the identifier; creating the target server-side control object in the server-side control hierarchy, if the target server-side control object is not found by the searching operation; and terminating the server-side control hierarchy, after the operation of generating authoring language data. However, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to extend the teachings of Ferris to include the above in order to create a complete system that searches for the appropriate control object and creates objects as necessary.

26. As per claim 6, Ferris does not teach the method wherein the identifier has a hierarchical identifier structure indicating a plurality of levels in a server-side control object hierarchy including a plurality of member server-side control objects, and the operation of identifying the target server-side control object comprises: extracting a node level identifier from the identifier; passing the node level identifier to a member server-side control object corresponding to the node level identifier; identifying the member server-side control object as the target



Art Unit: 2174

server-side control object, if the node level identifier identifies a leaf node of the identifier; extracting a next node level identifier from the identifier of the target server-side control object, if the node level identifier does not identify a leaf node of the identifier, wherein the next node level identifier identifies a child server-side control object of the member server-side control object; and performing recursively the passing and identifying operations and the operation of extracting a next node level identifier using the next node level identifier as the node level identifier and the child server-side control object as the member server-side control object, if the node level identifier does not identify a leaf node of the identifier. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extend the teaching of Ferris to include the above in order to create a system with hierarchical identifiers in order to provide a method to identify target server-side control objects quickly.

27. As per claim 8, Ferris does not teach the method wherein the target server-side control object initially stores an old data value as a property, and the operation of storing a postback data value comprises: associating the postback data value with the property; indicating a data change associated with the target server-side control object, if the postback data value passed to the target server-side control object is different than the old data value of target server-side control object; and replacing the old data value with the postback data value in the target server-side control object. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend the teachings of Ferris in order to create a system where old data values are indicated and replaced in order to maintain an up to date system.

28. As per claim 9, Ferris does not teach the method comprising: raising a server-side data change event after the operation of replacing of the old data value, if a data change indicated. However, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend the teachings of Ferris to create a system where a server-side data change event is raised after an old data value is replaced.

29. As per claim 10, Ferris does not teach the method wherein the target server-side control object is one of a plurality of member server-side control objects in a server-side control object hierarchy, and the operation of storing a postback data value comprises: storing postback data values for all of the member server-side control objects in the server side control object hierarchy; and raising at least one server-side data change event after the operation of storing a postback data value for all member server-side control objects, if at least one data change is indicated. However, it would have been obvious to of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend Ferris's system to store postback data values for all of the member server-side control objects and raise at least one server-side data change event.

30. As per claim 11, Ferris does not teach the method comprising receiving the server-side data change event from the target server-side control object; and invoking a function of a non-user-interface server component, based on the server side data change event. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend

Art Unit: 2174

Ferris's system to receive the server-side data change event and invoke a function of a non-user-interface server component.

31. As per claims 13, 14 and 15, Ferris does not teach the method wherein the operation of processing a postback event comprises: extracting from the postback input a postback event argument associated with the identifier; passing the postback event argument associated with the identifier to the target serverside control object; processing the postback event argument using the target server-side control object, the operation of processing a postback input further comprises: raising a server-side event from the target server-side control object, responsive to the operation of processing the postback event argument; receiving the server-side event from the target server-side control object; and invoking a function of a non-user-interface server component, based on the server-side. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to extend the teachings of Ferris to include the above.

32. As per claim 20, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 5.

### ***Response To Argument***

1. In the remarks, applicant has argued in substance that:

(1) Ferris fails to disclose or suggest "server-side control objects."

(2) Ferris fails to disclose or suggest the recited examining, passing, and processing of the postback input received from the client.

(3) Ferris fails to disclose a server-side control object hierarchy.

2. Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments and resubmits that

As to point (1), Ferris does disclose server-side control objects, that logically corresponds to client-side user interface elements," and generates authoring language code at the server (page 6, lines 3-10, page 7, lines 10-15). It is described that the server-side control objects (CGI program) corresponds with the client-side user interface elements (buttons, lists, menus....) and processes the document, written the HTML code language.

As to point (2), Ferris teaches the recited examining, passing and processing of the postback input received from the client. Page 6, lines 8-26, describe how the postback input (FORM) is transmitted as a single unit to a gate program on the HTTP server, where it processed during the execution of the gateway program (page 7, lines 12-16).

As to point (3), Ferris discloses a server-side object hierarchy (page 6, lines 5-7). Since the FORM element includes, menus, there is system of hierarchy that must be in place within the menus on both the client and server sides.

### ***Conclusion***

6. This action is a **final rejection, necessitated by amendment**, and is intended to close the prosecution of this application. Applicant's reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to this action is limited either to an appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences or to an amendment complying with the requirements set forth below.

If applicant should desire to appeal any rejection made by the examiner, a Notice of Appeal must be filed within the period for reply identifying the rejected claim or claims appealed. The Notice of Appeal must be accompanied by the required appeal fee.

Art Unit: 2174

If applicant should desire to file an amendment, entry of a proposed amendment after final rejection cannot be made as a matter of right unless it merely cancels claims or complies with a formal requirement made earlier. Amendments touching the merits of the application which otherwise might not be proper may be admitted upon a showing a good and sufficient reasons why they are necessary and why they were not presented earlier.

A reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection must include the appeal from, or cancellation of, each rejected claim. The filing of an amendment after final rejection, whether or not it is entered, does not stop the running of the statutory period for reply to the final rejection unless the examiner holds the claims to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, if a Notice of Appeal has not been filed properly within the period for reply, or any extension of this period obtained under either 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b), the application will become abandoned.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sindya Narayanaswamy whose telephone number is (703) 305-8473. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am to 5 pm, first Fridays off. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-5404. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9000.

Application/Control Number: 09/574,165

Page 13

Art Unit: 2174

November 25, 2003

Sindya Narayanaswamy

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100